DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 776 SO 011 943

AUTHOR Rinehart, Sue Tolleson
TITLE The Mischief of Factions: Political Parties in School Textbooks.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 36p.; Paper prepared for delivery at Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Washington, D.C., August 31-September 3, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Civics; Educational Needs; *History Textbooks; *Political Affiliation; Political Science; Secondary Education; Textbook Bias; *Textbook Content; *Textbook Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Democratic Party; Republican Party

ABSTRACT

An analysis of the treatment of political parties in four history and civics textbooks is presented. Three high school and one junior high texts, all currently in use, were examined to identify any mentioning of a political party. Variables included mention of all or both parties, the degree and locus of conflict mentioned, the context in which the party was mentioned, the presentation of issues, mention of the function of parties, treatments of patronage and corruption, and the subjective nature of the presentations. Findings indicated that third parties are generally ignored. Also, although the party function of policy direction was stressed somewhat more than had been anticipated, electoral functions were dominant in the treatments. Mention of excessive patronage and corruption was far less than hypothesized: neither individual parties nor parties generally were portrayed as corrupt or overly indulgent in patronage activities. In analyzing the subjective nature of the texts, it was found that history books are likely to be more negative than positive while the reverse is true for civics books. Finally, the parties' stands on issues and party functions tended to be weakly illustrated. The author concludes that a sophisticated and dynamic conception of political parties is missing from the texts. Further, students do not understand why parties exist and what they actually contribute to the system. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175776

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sue Tolleson Rinehart
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE MISCHIEF OF FACTIONS:

POLITICAL PARTIES IN SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS*

Sue Tolleson Rinehart

Rutgers University

Prepared for delivery at the 1979 Annual Meeting of The American Political Science Association, The Washington Hilton Hotel, August 31-September 3, 1979. Copyright by The American Political Science Association.

SO 011 943

Everywhere in the world, children spend much of their time learning how to be adults. They are taught the rules and norms of their society, gradually accumulating by rote and understanding a body of skills and knowledge enabling them to move sucessfully into the adult world. A considerable amount of this preparation for adulthood occurs in the classroom.

In many societies this tutelage in adult behavior includes a heavy dose of civic training. Nowhere is this more evident than in the United States, where the schools have long accepted their mission to produce the ubiquitous but often vaguely delineated "good citizen". While American schools are busily generating good citizenship, the American culture is equally busy encouraging a deep ambivalence about political parties. From the outset of the working of our political system, parties have been simultaneously shunned and embraced, warned against while thoroughly employed.

How and why is our political culture transmitting such conflicting messages? What is the role of the schools in this process? Can the traditional American reluctant acceptance of political parties arise de novo in the adult, or is it germinated in the atmosphere of civic training to which adolescents are exposed?

Answers to these questions can be sought in a variety of ways. One avenue of inquiry requires the evaluation of the

schools' curricula, and that is the method we have chosen. The textbook is one if not the major learning resource in American pre-college education, and therefore must be partially responsible for the quality of the content of civic education. By analyzing this content we may find certain keys to political behavior, and at least can do no worse than eliminating some assumptions about political learning. A content analysis of textbooks' treatments of political parties may shed some light on the roots of American beliefs about them.

Several limitations on the usefulness of this kind of investigation immediately present themselves. First, any single project of this type is likely to be too small to produce any generalizable findings. Second, by lifting the textbook out of the larger environment of schooling, we deprive ourselves of the opportunity to assess interactive effects by and on it. Third and perhaps most important, we cannot know how the text material is being absorbed and used when we rely on content analysis alone. It remains worthwhile to know what is there, however. This paper is the result of an endeavor to fill a small gap in that knowledge by content analyzing four History and Civics texts and their presentations of political parties.

Theoretical Perspectives

Scholars such as Austin Ranney, Richard Hofstadter and Gerald M. Pomper, among others, have frequently noted

the American mentality combining what Ranney calls "anti-party thought and partisan action."[1] While virtually endless voting behavior studies attest to the fact that large numbers of Americans (we can no longer comforatably say "most") identify with political parties,[2] and scholars of socialization know that the sources of this identification include family and peer groups,[3] identifying with a party does not necessarily imply approval of the concept of parties generally. Jack Dennis found rather striking confirmation of this ambivalence among Wisconsin voters.[4] Evidence of the same discordance of thought and action among political elites themselves can be found across time: from The Federalist and George Washington's State of the Union Address to Robert LaFollette's Progressives; from Wilson's "amateur Democrat" to the McGovern-Fraser Commission.[5] All provide a strong case indeed for the breadth and depth of this anomalous feature of our political culture.

One other result of the voting behavior research which may have special implications for the present concern is the extent of party identification among young voters. As many as three quarters of young people surveyed have eschewed party identification,[6] and we may tentatively advance two hypotheses based on these findings. First, if party identifiers do not entirely support the parties as institutions, we might suppose that independents are at least as skeptical about them, if not markedly more so. Second, note that the young are the group most likely to reject party identification:

the age group nearest in time to their schooling and their civic training. Can that civics training be held partially accountable? What exactly is the school contributing to the process of political learning?

Agents of political socialization are usually divided into three groups: the family, social groups, and the schools. Few would argue the socializing potential of formal education, and its ability, in V.O. Key's words, to "indoctrinate the coming generation with the basic outlooks and values of the political order."[7] The schools themselves have accepted and vigorously executed the charge on them to inculcate civic values.[8] Besides the teacher and the entire school environment, the curriculum itself is viewed as a powerful transmitter of the desired qualities of good citizenship.[9]

Research on the curriculum's impact and content yields contradictory findings. Some conclude that textbook treatments of American politics reinforce knowledge and values best when they are in harmony with other aspects of the socialization experience,[10] while other findings suggest that the curriculum makes little if any difference.[11] The two studies most directly bearing on our research, however, are in close agreement on one facet of textbook portrayals of politics. Litt and Massialas, in separate studies, concluded that American politics is portrayed in a bland and often unrealistic way, focusing on history and formal structure at the expense of a conception of politics which includes actors, power, and conflict management.[12]

Competition for power and goods, competing group demands: these very political qualities which textbooks apparently fail to convey are, after all, the heart of party politics. If the specific treatment of parties is as lifeless and unsophisticated as these previous studies lead one to suspect, we should express little surprize at the prevailing disaffection for parties. If a component of the disaffection is an ingenuous ignorance about them (as it surely must be), then the school curriculum must be held accountable for part of this ignorance.

The remainder of the paper will be spent addressing some of these issues by presenting the results of content analyzing four books.

The Data and Methods

The four texts used were selected on the basis of four criteria: availability, recent publication, and grade level and subject. The small scope of the project dictated that readily available books be used. In practical terms, this meant that our resources were limited to the curriculum library of the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education and local schools. After consulting El-High Textbooks in Print, 1978 to ascertain which books might be appropriate, it was found that Rutgers and Highland Park (N.J.) High School could provide books from the list in three cases. In the fourth case, that of the junior high Civics text, nothing short of buying one copy of a book from the publisher seemed

feasible, and that was later done. Once our initial list was narrowed to what was available, a further screening process was imposed by selecting books with the latest copyright date and/or the most recent edition. This was our best presently possible means of assessing both currency and usage. Of the eventually chosen books, one had a 1974 publication date, one was published in 1975, and two were published in 1977. Three of the books were in second (and revised) editions and the remaining book had gone to a third edition, suggesting that all the books had been put to substantial use. Finally, the books were categorized by junior (grades 7-9) and senior (grades 9-12) high school levels, and by whether they were American History or American Civics books.

It must be stressed again that the books examined do not constitute a sample of any sort, nor is any claim of representativeness made. The results of the present research can be seen, rather, as a very limited and tentative foray into American History and Civics curricula as a whole.

Once the selected texts were in hand they were read sentence by sentence, and any sentence mentioning a party or parties was directly transcribed. This process netted a total of 2057 statements. The number of statements found in individual texts is reported several times below. The total amount of space devoted to political parties in each book can be most simply expressed thus: if the distribution of statements were monotonic, a mention of party would occur slightly more than once per page. The exception is the junior high Civics book, with a ratio of 231 statements

to 502 pages.

A coding scheme was then developed which contained two identification variables, one temporal variable and eleven measures of particular features of the content. The author was the sole coder, and some caution about data reliability must be entertained because of this. We are confident that the internal consistency of the coding is quite high, however.

Each statement was given an identification number and coded by grade level. The statements were then coded on substance: were parties themselves under scrutiny or was party used only as a label? The next two variables coded identified specific parties. One variable was reserved for the first and/or most prominent party featured, while the second variable contained additional parties mentioned when this occurred.

The party code was structured by four major categories. The first division included mentions of "all" or "both" parties. The second category included the Democrats, Republicans, and their historical antecedents. The third division contained mentions of novel third parties, parties which arose spontaneously rather than splintering from established parties. The fourth division was reserved for remaining, miscellaneous mentions, including those about campaign organizations or party systems different from the American one.

Statements were scored on the degree and locus of conflict they mentioned. The levels of conflict used included none,

normal political opposition, significant conflict (indicated by the specific use of words such as "bitterness"), and extreme conflict (resulting in party splits, regional polarization, or violence, for example). The locus of conflict might be within the party, between or among parties, or a party/non-party dispute.

Each statement was coded on whether the party was presented in a specific context, and if so, whether that context was intraparty organizational, electoral, or institutional (including all levels of government).

The presentation of issues in conjunction with the party was also treated contextually rather than substantively, according to our reasoning that it was more important to know what the party-issue relationship was than to know the specific issue. Were single issues raised, or issues as a part of a broad ideology? Were the issues of coalition building mentioned? Were issues stressed in the context of platforms or institutional programs? Also coded were mentions of issues specific to elections themselves, such as Catholic Republican voters' response to Kennedy.

Mentions of the functions of political parties were divided into the following groups of tasks: candidate selection; campaigning;interest aggregation; interest articulation; conflict management; socialization; and patronage and appointments.

A separate variable was created to account for treatments of patronage and corruption. "Normal" patronage mentions included statements illustrating the parties' position-filling

opportunities, while "unacceptable" patronage mentions indicated appointments of unqualified people and the like, acts portrayed as short of illegality but nonetheless undesirable. Corruption as it is usually understood was duly coded when mentions of it occurred.

A variable indicating the objective evaluation in each statement was also used. This variable divides those actions presented as sucessful from those portrayed as unsucessful, without distinguishing between the kinds of actions presented.

The last substantive variable used in the analysis was an indicator of affect. With this variable we tried to capture the subjective nature of the presentations. The scoring on affect depended on the use of language, especially descriptive language. Words such as "notorious" or "extremist" in a statement caused it to be scored as producing negative affect, while phrases such as "healing the nation's wounds" or "spirit of cooperation" were thought to convey positive affect. Simple reportorial accounts and statements over which the coder experienced any indecision were assigned to a neutral category.

Finally, statements were ordered chronologically. The divisions used were chosen to conform to the major periods of party development and change emphasized by scholars such as Burnham, Chambers and Sundquist.[13]

This rather elaborate coding scheme notwithstanding, the resulting data were not sufficiently rigorous to bear equally elaborate statistical manipulation. Frequency

distributions and contingency tables provided the happy solution, being more than adequate to our analytical needs without insulting methodological integrity.

Some Hypotheses

Several hypotheses about the textbook presentations of political parties helped to structure our analysis. A brief description of them follows.

First, we posited that third parties would be insubstantially treated, in accordance with the overwhelming emphasis on two-party politics in this country. The more "anti-system" the party, we additionally felt, the less attention we would see paid to it.

Second, we expected to find the electoral context of party activity overrepresented. While electoral politics is no doubt a raison d'etre of political parties, we predicted an emphasis on this context at the expense of the party in government or the party organization itself.

A series of hypotheses about the functions of parties were developed. We posited that the well-accepted perception of Western parties as interest aggregators and articulators and managers of conflict would not be significantly reflected in these texts. Neither did we look for portrayals of the party as a socialization agent, as one of the resources available to citizens trying to order the political world. By understating these facets of the political party, we posited that the texts would be obscuring the picture of parties as

an integral part of our political sytem, and thereby indirectly contributing to the prevalent disaffection discussed above.

We additionally predicted that a disproportionate ammount of attention to such unpalatable party activities as those involving corruption would be seen.

The next section describes the results of our investigation, followed by a discussion of the implications of these findings.

Findings

The preliminary results of our investigation can be seen in Tables I and II. Following is a discussion of these findings.

As hypothesized, third parties, historically or generally, are virtually ignored. Only 6 percent of the total number of statements is devoted to American novel third parties, and 52 percent of this number are references to the Populist party alone. Less than one half of one percent of the statements concern the Socialist and Communist parties in this country, and no notice at all is taken of others such as the Women's Party or the Libertarian Party.

Subsequent hypotheses also received at least partial support from these data with the exception of our expectations concerning the treatment of corruption. The most frequently seen context is that of electoral politics, although one out of four contextual settings is institutional. When an issue is mentioned in conjunction with the parties

it is more likely to be a single issue (frequently slavery or free enterprize economics), and issues as part of a party's platform appear a rare 4 percent of the time.

In line with this finding are the findings about attribution of function: the party is not often presented as an aggregator or articulator of interests. The important function of policy direction was stressed somewhat more than had been anticipated, but electoral functions are predictably dominant in the treatments. Less than 2 percent of the statements portray the party as a socialization agent. While the parties in their roles as conflict managers are paid an insignificant amount of attention, neither are they represented as being particularly conflictual themselves, as the large percentage of statements presenting only normal political opposition suggests.

Perhaps the most surprizing finding concerns the textbook accounts of excessive patronage and corruption. Nine times out of ten this side of political parties is not displayed. While the definite mentions of corruption are few, however, they do exceed mentions of normal and accepted patronage activities.

A crosstabulation of each variable by the others was done in order to unveil any patterns or trends in the treatments. The noteworthy results of this analysis are reported and discussed where appropriate below.

The remainder of the findings section is occupied with a closer examination of the contents of individual texts, and a more detailed look at the treatment of specific parties.

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF STATEMENTS BY PARTY

Parties generally	34.8%	(715)
Democrats	17.3	(355)
Jeffersonian Democrats	5.0	(102)
Jacksonian Democrats	2.7	(55)
Free Soil Democrats	.4	(8)
Dixiecrats	.1	(2)
(Agrregate Democrats)	(25.5%)	(522)
Republicans	19.7	(404)
Federalists	4.6	(95)
Whigs	4.5	(92)
Constitutional Union	.1	(2)
Radical Republicans	2.7	(55)
Roosevelt Progressives	.4	(9)
(Aggregate Republicans)	(32.0%)	(657)
Novel Third Parties	.8	(16)
Populists	3.1	(64)
Progressives	.5	(11)
Know-Nothings	.3	(7)
Anti-Masons	.1	(3)
Liberty	.0	(1)
Greenback	.3	(7)
National Labor Reform	.1	(2)
Socialists	.4	(8)
Communists	.0	(1)

TABLE I (continued)

American Independent	.2%	(4)
Women's Party	.0	(0)
Libertarians	.0	(0)
(Aggregate Third Parties)	(5.8%)	(124)
One-Party Systems	.5	(11)
Multi-Party Systems	.7	(15)
Candidate Campaign Organizations	.5	(11)
	99.8%*	(2057)

*Percentages do not add to 100% because of rounding.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF STATEMENTS BY CONTENT

Grade Level		
Junior-high	36.7%	(755)
Senior-high	63.3	(1302)

Level of Conflict		
None	34.5%	(710)
Normal opposition	44.8	(921)
Significant	13.4	(276)
Extreme	7.3	(150)

Context		
Non-specific	4.0%	(83)
Organizational	23.2	(477)
Electoral	45.7	(940)
Institutional	27.1	(557)

Presentation of Issues		
No Issue	43.5%	(895)
Single Issue	18.4	(379)
Coalition-building	9.0	(186)
Electoral	7.0	(145)
Platform	4.2	(87)
Institutional	11.3	(233)
Broad Ideology	6.4	(132)

Substance		
No	12.9%	(266)
Yes	87.1	(1791)

Locus of Conflict		
Intra-party	27.5%	(371)
Between parties	67.6	(911)
Party/non-party	4.9	(66)
Missing		(710)

Patronage and Corruption		
None	91.3%	(1878)
Normal	2.5	(51)
Excessive	1.9	(39)
Corruption	3.5	(73)
Attempts to reform	.8	(16)

TABLE II (continued)

Party Function		
Candidate Selection	22.4%	(428)
Campaigning	26.1	(498)
Policy Director	17.4	(332)
Interest Aggregator	8.8	(168)
Interest Articulator	14.5	(278)
Conflict Management	3.2	(61)
Socialization Agent	1.6	(31)
Appointment-making	6.0	(115)
No function given		(146)
Evaluation		
Unsuccessful	18.6%	(383)
Neutral	45.0	(925)
Successful	36.4	(749)
Affect		
Negative	18.7%	(384)
Neutral	67.0	(1379)
Positive	14.3	(294)
Time Period		
General	31.4%	(645)
1776-99	5.4	(112)
1800-24	5.8	(120)
1825-59	9.8	(201)
1860-95	18.8	(386)
1896-1928	7.7%	(159)
1929-52	6.7	(137)
1952-Present	14.4	(297)

The Books

Let us turn now to differences in treatment by grade level and subject. As we saw in Table II, 63 percent of the statements were found in senior-high texts, and 37 percent came from the junior-high books. Only 12.9 percent of the statements used the party to identify an actor without substantively treating the party itself. But of those 266 statements, 47.3 percent of them were located in the lower grade level books, a somewhat disproportionately large number. Only one fifth of the mentions included indications of significant or extreme levels of conflict, but over 60 percent of these came from the senior-high books. Fifty-one percent of the lower division books' party mentions presented no conflict of any sort, while 75 percent of the upper division statements included mentions of conflict. In the junior-high books, 65 percent of the statements neglected to place the party in a specific context and, by contrast, 65 and 72 percent of the statements emphasizing organizational and institutional contexts, respectively, were found in the senior-high books. Statements embedded in an electoral context were proportionately distributed across the two grade level divisions. The number of statements devoid of a treatment of issues are divided equally among junior- and senior-high books, as is true of presentations of issues within a broad party ideology. But among statements presenting issues in the more sophisticated contexts of coalition building, platform writing, and the institutional

and electoral arenas, more than two-thirds are found in the two senior-high books. Clearly, sophistication of treatment is partially a function of grade level.

One of the key queries in this research concerned the handling of party functions. Table III shows the distribution of functions across the four books examined.

TABLE III

PARTY FUNCTION BY BOOKS

	Junior History	Junior Civics	Senior History	Senior Civics
Candidate Selection	31.2%	29.4%	19.6%	15.3%
Campaigning	22.8	29.9	24.8	29.5
Director of Policy	12.9	14.4	23.1	14.7
Interest Aggregation	5.7	7.2	10.8	9.4
Interest Articulation	14.6	9.3	16.6	13.7
Conflict Management	3.7	2.6	2.9	3.3
Socialization Agent	1.8	1.0	0.0	3.9
Appointments	7.2	6.2	2.2	10.2
	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(487)	(194)	(719)	(511)

(146 cases did not assign a function)

One expects after all that most statements about a party's function will emphasize electoral activities. And, as hypothesized, the party in its role as socializer or conflict resolver is rarely mentioned. What is surprizing is the comparatively large amount of attention devoted to the party as policy director and aggregator and articulator of interests, especially in the senior-high texts.

Another major question to be addressed is that of the presentation of excessive patronage and corruption on the part of the parties. For these four texts at least, the hypothesis about overemphasis on such phenomena appears to be thoroughly unjustified, as can be seen in Table IV. The two History books contain virtually all of the statements which do recount such activities, as one would expect, but these unsavory aspects of political parties are disproportionately represented in the junior-high account.

TABLE IV

CORRUPTION AND PATRONAGE

	Junior History	Junior Civics	Senior History	Senior Civics
None	87.6%	95.2%	93.1%	90.7%
Normal Patronage	.6	1.7	.7	7.1
Excessive Patronage	4.2	.4	1.7	.5
Corruption	7.3	.4	3.7	1.1
Attempts at reform	.4	2.2	.8	.5
	100.1%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%
	(524)	(231)	(751)	(551)

The senior-high Civics book contains three times as many statements about normal patronage activities as the other volumes combined, and less than one percent of the total number of statements showed party efforts to end corruption.

Finally, we wished to determine how the evaluations of party activities were distributed across the books, and

whether the affect displayed was positive or negative. Table V reveals the frequency distributions of evaluations of all party activities depicted. Was the party successful or unsuccessful in any given endeavor? If no evaluation were made or a particular action did not reach a conclusion within the confines of a particular statement, the neutral category was assigned.

TABLE V

ACTION EVALUATIONS

	Junior History	Junior Civics	Senior History	Senior Civics
Unsuccessful	23.5%	5.6%	20.0%	17.6%
Neutral	46.9	71.4	35.6	44.8
Successful	29.6	22.9	44.5	37.6
	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%
	(524)	(231)	(751)	(551)

It can be seen from the table that, with the exception of the upper level History text, neutrality appears to be the most frequently occurring evaluative stance. The balance of the remaining statements are more likely to contain successful than unsuccessful evaluations, however. It should be recalled here that the use of the term "action" does not imply one stereotypical party endeavor, but rather includes activities engaged in by the party in all of its aforementioned roles. The previous findings on party function, however, indicate that the majority of party activities evaluated

in the texts occurred in the electoral arena.

A far more subjective aspect of political party presentation is tapped by the indicator we have chosen to call affect. It will be remembered that this indicator relies on the use of adjectives, characterizations, and the general tenor of the language in the statement, and thus must be regarded with considerable caution. With any case in which we experienced the least doubt as to scoring, the neutral category was assigned. These statements along with those which were simply reportorial in nature make the neutral category by far the largest one in each of the texts, as Table VI shows.

TABLE VI

AFFECT

	Junior History	Junior Civics	Senior History	Senior Civics
Negative	26.5%	6.1%	21.8%	12.2%
Neutral	59.7	75.8	66.4	71.1
Positive	13.7	18.2	11.7	16.7
	99.9%	100.1%	99.9%	100.0%
	(524)	(231)	(751)	(551)

Disregarding the middle category for the moment, a perhaps unlooked-for finding emerges. Among statements which do convey affect, the History books are somewhat more likely to be negative than positive, while the reverse is to be found in both Civics books. Two partial explanations for

this phenomenon might be put forward: first, the Civics books simply may be authored by individuals more kindly disposed to political parties than those who wrote the History books.[14] Second, the history books record periods in the past when some party activities could not be cast in other than a negative light, despite the inclinations of the author. The Civics texts would not be so constrained.

While it is not presently possible to draw conclusions about the first assertion, our findings can shed some light on the validity of the second one. In fact, 51 percent of all statements projecting negative affect were made while recounting events in the nineteenth century, and all but eight of the statements about this period are in the History books. While perhaps not always justifiably, the History texts appear to reflect some disapproval and dismay at the occasions of deep and often bitter disputes associated with the political parties of that time. Fifty-seven percent of the statements mentioning significant conflict, and 78 percent of those recounting extreme conflict, occur in the context of the nineteenth century, especially the latter half. These illustrations of severe intra- and inter-party conflict are correlated with negative affect (Gamma= -.30). The vast majority of incidences of party corruption also arise from accounts of nineteenth century politics (especially from 1860 to 1895), and mentions of corruption also correlate highly with negative affect (Gamma= -.54). One wonders to what extent these impressions of divisiveness and clandestine acts

remain with the students, even after the memory of specific details recedes.

The Treatment of the Parties

The distribution of party mentions presented earlier showed about one-third of the statements devoted to parties generally, one-third to the Republicans and their historical antecedents, one-quarter to the Democrats and their predecesors, 6 percent to novel third parties and a scant 2 percent to candidate campaign organizations and single- and multi-party systems. Table VII displays the distributions of each of the content variables across these party groupings.

We see that significant or extreme levels of conflict are more likely to be associated with a Republican mention than with any other category. A great deal of this Republican conflict can be attributed to the problems of Reconstruction, when Radical Republicans not only "waved the bloody shirt" at the Democrats but hotly debated Reconstruction policies among themselves. Conflict of any sort is not as frequently seen in statements about third parties for the simple reason that most statements mentioning these parties were occupied by descriptions of the parties' ideological goals and identifiers rather than depictions of their activities in the electoral arena. The most frequent locus of conflict was, predictably, between or among parties.

The indicator of context also offers few surprizes. The two major parties are discussed in an electoral context a majority of the time, while more attention is paid to the

organizational context of third parties. No more than a third of the time can the party in government be seen, and the Republicans are slightly more likely than the Democrats to be so portrayed.

The parties' stands on issues are rather weakly illustrated. About a third of the time no issues are associated with any particular party, and this figure increases to a substantial 60 percent when the concept of parties generally is under scrutiny. The next largest treatment of issues is in a single issue context. The issues of coalition building and issues as part of a platform, considered prominent features of party politics by scholars, are singularly underrepresented here. Another key concept, that of the party as a provider of a broad and coherent ideology, is virtually absent from these texts. While the illustration of third party ideology is proportionately much greater than that presented for the Democrats and Republicans, so small is the absolute number of such statements that this important aspect of party politics can hardly be forcefully transmitted to young readers.

The case for the treatment of party functions is much the same. No significant variation between the two major parties can be found across the range of functions, and both parties are cast predominantly in their electoral roles. The party as interest articulator is seen largely in conjunction with third parties, and once again the absolute number of statements is doubtless too small to have an impact.

TABLE VII

CONTENT OF SPECIFIC PARTY TREATMENTS

	Democrats	Republicans	Third	All Parties
Conflict				
None	26.4%	27.4%	40.3%	45.4%
Normal Opposition	46.4	36.2	46.0	50.9
Significant	16.5	24.0	10.5	2.5
Extreme	10.7	12.3	3.2	1.2
	(522)	(657)	(124)	(754)
Locus of Conflict				
Intra-party	37.5%	34.8%	2.7%	14.3%
Between, among parties	58.3	61.2	85.1	80.4
Party v. non-party	4.2	4.0	12.2	5.3
	(384)	(477)	(74)	(413)
Context				
Non-specific	3.1%	3.0%	17.7%	3.3%
Organizational	10.9	10.8	30.6	41.2
Electoral	56.5	52.2	39.5	33.6
Institutional	29.5	33.9	12.1	21.9
	(522)	(657)	(124)	(754)
Issues				
None	36.4%	31.8%	25.8%	61.4%
Single	24.1	28.0	15.3	6.6
Coalition	9.2	10.4	9.7	7.7
Electoral	5.7	10.5	4.8	5.3
Platform	4.6	2.9	15.3	3.3
Institutional	10.1	11.4	8.9	11.1
Broad Ideology	7.9	5.0	19.4	4.5
	(522)	(657)	(124)	(754)

TABLE VII (continued)

	Democrats	Republicans	Third	All Parties
Function				
Candidate Selection	30.1%	21.2%	10.3%	19.9%
Campaigning	23.7	28.1	23.3	26.5
Policy Director	17.7	22.0	6.0	14.9
Interest Aggregator	8.8	9.3	14.7	7.4
Interest Articulator	12.9	14.5	44.8	10.6
Conflict Management	2.4	2.6	0.0	4.9
Socialization Agent	.6	.2	.9	3.8
Appointment-making	3.8	2.1	.0	12.2
	(502)	(613)	(116)	(680)
Patronage				
None	93.9%	90.3%	100.0%	89.0%
Normal Patronage	.8	.3		6.0
Excessive Patronage	2.1	2.7		1.3
Corruption	2.7	6.1		2.5
Attempts to Reform	.6	.6		1.2
	(522)	(657)	(124)	(754)
Evaluation				
Unsuccessful	19.9%	23.9%	20.2%	12.9%
Neutral	35.6	39.3	34.7	58.1
Successful	44.4	36.8	45.2	29.0
	(522)	(657)	(124)	(754)
Affect				
Negative	17.6%	26.9%	12.9%	13.1%
Neutral	67.2	63.9	67.7	69.5
Positive	15.1	9.1	19.4	17.4
	(522)	(657)	(124)	(754)
Time				
General	2.1%	2.1%	11.3%	80.4%
1776-99	8.6	6.4	0.0	3.3
1800-24	11.3	8.4	0.0	.8

TABLE VII (continued)

Time	Democrats	Republicans	Third	All Parties
1825-59	12.5%	17.0%	8.9%	1.7%
1860-95	16.5	30.6	45.2	5.7
1896-1928	7.9	12.0	23.4	1.3
1929-52	12.3	9.1	4.8	.9
1952-Present	28.9	14.3	6.5	5.8
	(522)	(657)	(124)	(754)

The striking finding about patronage and corruption is that there isn't one. Neither individual parties nor parties generally are portrayed as corrupt or even as over-indulgent in patronage activites. One might even consider that normal patronage is inadequately represented here. The few exceptions to this trend are accounted for in the main by some Republican activities after the Civil War, for example. Another partial explanation for the lack of findings can be found in the treatment of political machines. Many of the mentions of machines are absent from this analysis because they were specific descriptions of the bosses themselves, so isolated from the party that, without additional cues, the average student would not necessarily associate the two. It should also be pointed out that only two statements attributing Watergate to the Republican Party itself were found.

On the question of how party actions were evaluated, some unexpected findings emerged. The Democrats, third parties and parties generally were presented as successful actors two and a half times as often as unsuccessful ones. The Republicans did not fare as well, although accounts of success here too outnumbered unsuccessful ones. For the major parties and parties generally much of the success was in the electoral arena. Some third party success was electoral, but the balance of the positive evaluations could be found in statements emphasizing issues initiated by third parties and later widely accepted. Typical of these kinds of statements were mentions

of the Populist drive for popularly elected Senators, and the initiative, referendum and recall. La Follette's Progressives shared some of this limelight with the Populists. The Democrats, too, received some attention and some evaluations of success on issues such as the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The findings on affect vary from those on evaluation. While two-thirds of the statements in all categories appeared to be free of affect, the remaining distributions reveal more negative than positive feelings about the Democratic and Republican parties. Third parties generally fare better, as do statements treating parties generally. The civics books, as mentioned before, contribute the most positive affect for parties. Why the Democrats and especially the Republicans are not positively portrayed more often is less readily explained. Mentions of unacceptable levels of patronage and corruption contribute, as do actions on controversial issues such as slavery. Many of the statements about Radical Republican activity produced negative affect. Southern Democrats were occasionally singled out for censure. The cumulative force of these negative presentations, however, must here remain an unmeasured quantity.

The importance of particular time periods has already been discussed in the cases of affect, conflict and corruption. The latter half of the nineteenth century is once again prominent as the period of greatest third party activity of all kinds.

Some Concluding Implications

Despite the quantity of information which these four texts contain, one would hesitate to call the treatment of political parties thorough. As our lengthy array of findings should have made clear, what seems to be missing from these books is a sophisticated and dynamic conception of political parties. What we find instead is a sometimes woefully simplistic picture of them, conjured up by statements like this one from the junior-high Civics text: "Voters are urged to help the party of their choice by spending as much money as they can afford." While twelve year-old girls and boys cannot be expected to grapple with theories of minimum winning coalitions, surely we can find suitable ways of introducing concepts of power, compromise and bargaining to them. The situation improves somewhat as grade levels advance, and yet we are by no means confident that students are ever made to understand why parties exist and what they actually contribute to our political system.

Much of the relevant education literature concerns itself with a debate over the merits of teaching social studies versus social science.[15] The question implicit in the debate--whether to convey facts or opportunities for analytical reasoning--is not new to political scientists, bearing as it has on the disposition of our own research. Perhaps the question contains a new element here, though. American school textbooks seem to have provided factual accounts without also providing an atmosphere conducive to

synthesis and analysis on the part of the student. This preference for fact and formal structure is markedly evident in the books we analzed, and with the History books it is certainly understandable. What the student is left with, however, is a fleeting image of the Jeffersonian Republicans against the Federalists or the dispute between Conscience and Cotton Whigs, effortlessly forgotten by the second day of summer vacation, rather than a lasting impression of political conflict and the need to constrain and channel it. The Civics books are equally culpable: is it better to spin out plodding explanations of State Party Committee organization, or to offer a briefer dissection of formal structure and an example suggesting that parties have the same kinds of organizing troubles a school club has?

Our personal experiences have repeatedly reaffirmed the notion that Americans infrequently contemplate and accept the idea of politics itself, and thus do not recognize the party as a vital and integral part of the political system. The stiff, date-burdened and oversimplified illustration of parties we often encountered in this content analysis must be at least partially responsible for such attitudes. If this is truly the case, then perhaps the best party reform of all would be a reformation of the way we teach our children about them.

*I would like to express my debt and thanks to Gerald M. Pomper, who suggested the idea for the project to me and secured financial support for me from the Eagleton Institute of Politics. Gratitude is also due to Roberta S. Sigel and Diane L. Fowlkes, both of whom steered me toward the education literature I needed but was completely unfamiliar with. Thanks to Laurily K. Epstein for her enthusiastic interest in the project's progress. None of these kind advisers bear any responsibility for the outcome.

[1]Austin Ranney, Curing the Mischiefs of Faction: Party Reform in America, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), p.22 and passim; see also Richard Hofstadter, The Idea of a Party System, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), Preface; Gerald M. Pomper, "The Contribution of Political Parties to American Democracy", paper delivered at Grinnell College, February 22, 1979, in honor of the retirement of Professor C. Edwin Gilmour.

[2]The classic study is of course Converse, Campbell, Miller and Stokes, The American Voter, (New York: Wiley, 1960); more recent and equally excellent research includes Norman Nie, Sidney Verba and John R. Petrocik, The Changing American Voter, (Cmbridge: Harvard University Press, 1976); and Sidney Verba and Norman Nie, Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality, (New York: Harper and Row, 1972).

[3]Ibid. See also specific studies such as M. Kent Jennings and Richard G. Niemi, "The Transmission of Political Values From Parent to Child", American Political Science Review,

(March 1968), pp. 169-184.

[4]Jack Dennis, "Support for the Party System by the Mass Public", American Political Science Review, (September 1966), pp. 600-615.

[5]James Q. Wilson, The Amateur Democrat: Club Politics in Three Cities, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966); Ranney, Mischiefs, passim.

[6]The American Voter, pp. 161-165; The Changing American Voter, pp. 60-64; Ranney, Mischiefs, p. 51n.

[7]Quoted in Roberta S. Sigel, ed., Learning About Politics, (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 328.

[8]Andreas M. Kazamias adn Byron G. Massialas, Tradition and Change in Education: a Comparative Study, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965), pp. 139-141; Richard Dawson, Kenneth Prewitt and Karen S. Dawson, Political Socialization 2nd Edition, (Boston: Little, Brown, 1977), Chapter VIII.

[9]Dawson, Prewitt and Dawson, p. 140.

[10]Edgar Litt, "Civic Education, Community Norms and Political Indoctrination", in Sigel, Ed., Learning About Politics, pp. 328-336.

[11]Kenneth P. Langton and M. Kent Jennings, "Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum in the United States", American Political Science Review, (September 1968), pp. 852-867.

[12]Litt, "Civic Education", pp. 330-331; Byron G. Massialas, "American Government: We Are the Greatest!", in C. B. Cox and Massialas, Eds., Social Studies in the United States:

A Critical Appraisal, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967), p. 191.

[13]See William Nisbet Chambers and Walter Dean Burnham, Eds., The American Party Systems, 2nd Edition, (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), Chapters I and X; and James Sundquist, The Dynamics of the Party System, (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1973).

[14]This is most likely the case with the senior-high Civics book, as it was authored by political scientists rather than educators.

[15]Cox and Massialas, Social Studies; Kazamias and Massialas, Tradition and Change in Education, are both devoted to the issue.